

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1–4, 6–15, 17–26, 28–40, and 42–53 were pending. Claims 1, 6–8, 14, 15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious due to Ghaffari (U.S. 5,751,220) in view of Kushita (U.S. 5,765,104). Claims 2–4, 23–26, 28–30, 35, 37–40, 42–44, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious due to Ghaffari in view of Kushita in further view of Olson (U.S. 7,127,633). Claims 9, 10, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious due to Ghaffari in view of Kushita in further view of Nguyen (U.S. 6,941,357 B2). Claims 31, 36, 45, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious due to Ghaffari in view of Kushita in further view of Olsen in even further view of Nguyen.

Claims 11–13, 19, 21, 22, 32–34, 46–48, and 51–53 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the claims would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants amend claims 1, 11, 12, 15, 19, 23, 32, 33, 37, 46, and 47. Applicants add claims 54–58. Claims 1–4, 6–15, 17–26, 28–40, and 42–58 remain pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

Examiner objected to claims 11–13, 19, 21, 22, 32–34, 46–48, and 51–53 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated the claims would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants amend base claims 1, 15, 23, and 37 to incorporate the allowable

subject matter of the dependent claims 11, 19, 32, and 46, respectively, along with any intervening claims. Applicants amend claims 11, 19, 32, and 46 to incorporate limitations originally appearing in canceled claims 5, 16, 27, and 41, respectively, and previously appearing in the independent claims. No new matter was added to any claim. Applicants amend claims 12, 33, and 47 to reflect proper dependency. Applicants add claims 54–58. Claim 54 is allowable in light of the allowable subject matter of claim 13, as indicated by Examiner. Similarly, claims 55–58 are allowable in light of the allowable subject matter of claims 21, 22, 34, and 48, respectively. If this is unclear, Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned. In light of the amendments, and Examiner’s indication of allowability, Applicants request that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Conclusion

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this document. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this document, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including

fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Conley Rose, P.C.'s
Deposit Account No. 03-2769/2120-02800/HTDC.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/Tim D. Chheda/
Tim D. Chheda
Reg. No. 60,752
Attorney for Applicants
Conley Rose, P.C.
P.O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
Ph: (713) 238-8000